

Water Quality Advisory Group  
July 27, 2000  
Room 1045

**Minutes**

Members present: John Wilkins, John Fekete, Tom Anderson and Matt Rueff.

Audience: Bob Johnson, Kari Simonelic, Barb Loller, Kiran Verma, Lonnie Brumfield, Barbara Scott and Christina Rousch.

John F.: Tom's 303 (d) question needs to be addressed. Does act prohibit increased discharges of specific pollutant into an impaired water body? Need a baseline on ambient background question. Bob and Kari explain documents. We do not want to get into a lot of deliberation but think about it and use for discussion at next meeting.

Bob: Three questions this group should address:

- what is significant lowering
- exemptions/exceptions to antidegradation process: what are they?
- define overall improvement

Lonnie: 431 question.

Bob: *Review of tables.* All in reference to high quality waters in second table. There needs to be a discussion of each one of these. Anything from federal GLI rule is also in our rule. Needs to have discussion on general permit rule. These are things people need to talk about. These are the things on the table to be discussed.

John F.: We will send information out to the members before the next meeting.

Bob: I will maintain list as appropriate.

Matt: Send comments to Barbara Scott and she will compile information. Also, have comments go to Barbara.

Bob: Page 4 – partially incorporate concept in GLI rule for clean up portion.

John F.: Put numbers on boxes.

Lonnie: Number tables.

Bob: Triggers to antidegradation. Review of chart.

John F.: Purpose of this is to understand antidegradation and steps that need to be taken. Using the perspective from permit writer was the easiest approach.

Bob: What determines this – that is what this chart is about. Used only high quality waters and focus on non bcc's. Can't apply same tests to all pollutants. This is a framework for people to start talking. Increase in permit limit – new idea. If doesn't trigger antidegradation then done. Basically a two step test.

John F.: Antidegradation implementation. This is only a presentation.

Bob: This is a starting point. Figure 3 – Qualitative Assessment will take some discussion.

Tom: Figure 2 – If permit doesn't exist – is there a fact sheet? Can not discharge without a permit.

Bob: We expect this pollutant to be in the discharge – here is what we expect the level of this pollutant to be.

John W.: Tom is asking if they didn't reveal it.

Bob: This refers to increased pollutants. How are we going to handle this discussion.

John F.: Great attempt in coming from permit writers perspective. Need feedback from permit writers. Focus attention on first table. The chart is the implementation component which we won't get to for awhile.

Matt: Mail hard copies of diagram.

Bob: Lonnie, Steve and permit writers review.

John F.: Do not mail out implementation ideas for now.

Barb: Good to discuss internally for the time being.

John F.: Report back from permit writers for the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Bob: Bill's original piece – edited/clarified.

John F.: Lonnie, discuss information he has put together.

Lonnie: Determining ambient background affects many things. Establishing protocol to follow for ambient background. May be different locations in receiving stream depending upon what we are talking about. *Review of handout.*

Matt: Going through TMDL process. Looking at seasonal sampling . At least 3 sets for TMDL's to have better understanding of non-point issues.

Tom: Samples – in addition to fixed stations or in combination?

Matt: In combination.

Tom: EPA guidance on ambient criteria? Anything more recent than 40 CFR 131.35?

Lonnie: Effluent sampling demonstrates compliance. There is no ambient guidance that I know of. How average data?

Bob: Kari – in the TMDL rule are these issues outlined?

Kari: Good methodology. EPA will put together some kind of guidance on this issue.

Bob: The fixed station and rotating basin monitoring have extensive list. There will be things that aren't on this list. May take years to permit. Make the assumption the background is zero.

Lonnie: What pollutants should be looked at? The question has to be answered and figured into the protocol.

Kari: Allocation of resources. What can we afford to do? The better the data the better. But we don't have the resources to collect a great deal of data. How can we be accurate and still afford it?

Matt: There is a workgroup being established from 431.

John W.: Resource ability should not completely drive this. Most industry through permit fees would contribute to accurate information. These seem to be technical questions not so much policy questions.

Kari: Add Texas to the list.

Barbara: Some states do not have an implementation plan like we are attempting to put together.

John W.: None have comprehensive stream sampling protocol.

Barbara: No implementation for ambient background protocol specifically.

Matt: Ohio has good stream protocols.

John W.: Texas and Colorado would also be good to contact.

Tom: North Dakota and Wyoming.

John F.: What should we be requesting? Texas – stream sampling. Kari and Bob – can you provide any information.

John W.: Ron Wukasch would have a lot of input on this issue.

Matt: Barbara can you contact Ron?

John F.: Asked all questions of Lonnie? This is a good starting point.

Lonnie: Should we take a stab at answering these questions?

John W.: I would like to hear your answers.

Matt: We can do that.

Bob: What do you do in the interim?

Matt: It is true on some of the utility plants. It's just a matter of getting through these.

John F.: Lonnie and Barbara can contact the other states.

Kari: I will do TMDL on QA/QC.

Bob: Take a look at the questions.

Matt: Barbara will contact Ron.

John W.: Stream sampling document that's approved. Is it large?

Matt: On the Web. Surface Water Quality Monitoring Strategy.

Tom: Take samples for e coli – problem with data that was thrown out. QA/QC – tests were not listed. Do we assume it meets criteria? Not doing TMDL for e coli.

Matt: Will check with Cyndi Wagner.

John F.: Expect to get feedback:

- input on table
- Kari's document comments

Funnel all information to Barbara. We will review information as updated.

Matt: Look at current Surface Water Monitoring Strategy. Lay out concepts on the questions.

Kari: What is role of dischargers? Some are collecting a lot of information. How much can they do?

John F.: Significant lowering – should we discuss? Have permit writers take a look at flow chart – then build on flow chart. Then distribute for discussion.

John F.: Get an idea where we are.

Lonnie: Ambient protocol stuff for the 9<sup>th</sup>?

Matt: Will give some comments.

John F.: Worth having this meeting? Should we continue this?

Bob: Useful for information gathering.

John F.: Notices and publications for public participation can be developed. Develop a framework. What is overall improvement should be added to list. 303(d) question of Tom's. How improve this meeting?

Bob: Which thing to table – can't discuss all.

Lonnie: Materials to people before meeting.

Barb: Just introduce and not discuss.

Tom: Existing vs. designated use.

Matt: Wet Weather Technical Advisory Group is working on this issue. Draft guidance in September.

John W.: Focus our discussion – get documents out early. We have been together for one year and I feel we are losing momentum. Would like to bring closure to some issues within 2-3 months.

Kari: We are trying to deal with complete antidegradation package. We need to work through technical issues before tackle policy.

Matt: Will pull appropriate technical people to work on this.

Adjournment